



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

to Genoa, does not affect appreciably the argument in the text.

I am grateful to Prof. Lounsbury for the suggestion that I should make my position in this matter clear. If my estimates are wrong, it should now at least be easy to correct them.

FRANK JEWETT MATHER, JR.

*Williams College.*

## LE PAS SALADIN.

### I.

#### *Introduction.*

THE author of the *Pas Saladin*, a historical poem of the Third Crusade, is unknown. The only copy of the poem hitherto discovered is that in manuscript No. 24432, of the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. The text, with the addition of a few historical notes, was published by M. Trébutien in 1836, but no study of the dialect of the poem has yet been attempted. The work of M. Trébutien is reviewed in the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, Vol. xxiii, 485, and is also referred to by M. Gaston Paris, in *La Légende de Saladin*, 37. (Extrait du *Journal des Savants*, mai à août 1893.)

The poem is short, containing but six hundred and eleven eight-syllable lines rhyming in pairs. The manuscript is in good condition and, legible, but carelessly written. Many of the rhymes are faulty, and the metre is not strictly observed, lines of seven or nine syllables being of frequent occurrence.

The object of the present paper is to determine the dialect of the poem, and the date of its composition. The text is an exact copy of the manuscript and agrees in the main with that of M. Trébutien.

The scene of the story is laid in Palestine. Philip Augustus, King of France, and Richard of England, have reached the Holy Land at a time when the country was all but conquered by the Saracens. The city of Jerusalem has been delivered into the hands of the enemy through treachery, and Guy, its King, sold to Saladin. But the arrival of the Crusaders has given renewed hope to the Christians. It is learned that the Saracens are to pass through a narrow defile, and Philip, with the twelve knights he has gathered around him, attacks

and completely overthrows the infidels. The Holy City is re-conquered and Guy restored to his throne. Richard who, as Duke of Normandy, is a vassal of the French crown, does not lead an independent army of his own, but is one of the knights fighting under the banner of Philip.

There is a striking resemblance between this little poem and the great Old French epic. We find the same contending parties—the French on one side, opposed to the Saracens on the other—and, as in the *Chanson de Roland*, the former are led by their king with his twelve paladins. The counterpart to the treachery of Ganelon is easily recognized in the treason that has given over the kingdom to Saladin; and though the ties of friendship between Roland and Oliver are wanting, Hugo de Florine and William de Barres, in our poem, are evidently reminiscences of those two paladins in the *Chanson*.

The similarity between the two poems extends not merely to the general outline, but even to some of the minor details. There is, however, one important difference. In the *Pas de Saladin* the parts are reversed in so far as it is the infidels and not the Christians, that meet with disaster. As in the battle of Roncevaux, the enemy, in this instance the Saracens, is met and overcome in a narrow pass. When their leader, King Escorcal, sees that the day is lost, he blows a horn to rally his friends around him, but all is in vain, and he is struck and cut down to the saddle by Richard. Similar prodigies of valor are, of course, performed by all the knights, who individually slay many of the infidels and apparently win the battle by their bravery alone. After this defeat, the Saracens, seeing that the passage is strongly guarded by the Christians, do not attempt a second encounter, but retreat for safety, to the fortified town of Damietta.

There is a fine spirit of chivalry running through the poem. All the odium is cast upon the traitors who have deceived their king and country. Saladin, although an infidel, is a generous enemy, and as Guy has lost all and is too poor to buy his freedom, he is set at liberty without payment of ransom. The excuse of Saladin is very characteristic. He retreats not before the superior number of the enemy,

but because, belonging to the order of knight-hood himself, he has loved chivalry all his days, and would not cause the death of so many brave knights for any amount of treasure.

The author in the above story makes use of two traditions which were quite generally credited during the Middle Ages. The first, that Richard with the aid of eleven companions defeated a large body of Saracens, is not without some foundation, as is shown by M. Paris, *loc. cit.*, 42.

On the first of August, 1192, the King of England landed at Jaffa, in order to reconquer the city which had lately fallen into the hands of the enemy.<sup>1</sup> A few days later and while still encamped outside the walls of the town, his forces were attacked by greatly superior numbers. Taken by surprise, the Christians could not have avoided defeat, but for the distinguished valor of Richard and a few knights, who alone had been able to procure horses.<sup>2</sup> This victory, though barren of ultimate results, was one of the most brilliant of the Third Crusade. The names of the nine warriors who followed the King at once became celebrated and are mentioned by the various chronicles, while a painting representing the scene of battle was executed by the order of Richard.<sup>3</sup>

To this original painting are probably to be traced those representations of the *Pas Saladin* mentioned by the author in lines 6 and 597. Similar ones were found in many of the castles during the thirteenth century; they represented Richard and eleven knights defending a narrow pass against a large Saracen army. King Philip, although present, does not take part in the combat, but directs it from a distance, and at its close welcomes the victors. On an eminence overlooking the field is posted a Saracen spy, who reports the progress of the battle and the names of the Christian knights engaged in it to Saladin, stationed on the other side of the hill. These names, as shown by marginal inscriptions, varied in the different paintings, while that of the spy was always Espiet or Tornevent.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Wilken, iv, 544; Stubbs, 407-409.

<sup>2</sup> " " 552.

<sup>3</sup> Gaston Paris, 43; Stubbs, 415-420.

<sup>4</sup> " " 42.

Two other versions of the same story are found in the Chronicles of Flanders and in Jean d'Avesnes, but neither can be considered as the source of the present poem. The first of these is very similar to the *Pas Saladin*, and the names of nine of the knights are the same.<sup>5</sup> In Jean d'Avesnes the entire episode is considerably shortened, and the scene laid in England, which the Sultan has invaded with the aid of a powerful fleet. On attempting to march inland, he is met and attacked at a narrow pass by twelve knights and forced to retreat.<sup>6</sup> The majority of the names of the knights still correspond with those in the *Pas Saladin*, and fully one-half are found in all three versions.<sup>7</sup>

The *Pas Saladin* was still popular at the close of the fourteenth century, and was even represented on the stage. Such a representation is described by Froissart in his *Chronicles*, Book IV, Chap. ii. It was given in honor of Isabel of Bavaria, on the occasion of her public entry into Paris, in 1389.<sup>8</sup> The play was probably founded upon the same version as that of our text. The twelve knights, including Richard, after receiving permission from King Philip, attack and completely rout a Saracen army commanded by Saladin. At the close of the battle the knights are also rewarded by Philip.

The author of the poem also accepts the tradition which says that the Holy Land was lost through treachery.<sup>9</sup> This report was generally credited by the French, and especially by the partisans of Guy de Lusignan, but is unsupported by any authorities. There was, indeed, a powerful faction among the nobles opposed to the election of Guy, but no overt act of treason was ever committed by them, and, at the invasion of Saladin, all parties united for the defense of the kingdom.<sup>10</sup>

The conspiracy occupies but a subordinate position in the *Pas Saladin*. The chief conspirator is the Quens de Tribles, and his four confederates are the Marcis de Ponferan,

<sup>5</sup> Gaston Paris, 43.

<sup>6</sup> " " 46.

<sup>7</sup> " " 44.

<sup>8</sup> " " 45; *Hist. Lit.* xxiii, 485.

<sup>9</sup> *Hist. Lit.* xxiii, 486.

<sup>10</sup> Michaud, ii, 40; Wilken, iiii, 252, 272.

Pierre Liban d'Ascalone, the Sires de Baru, and Quens Poru de Sate. These names indicate that the author was familiar with the tradition as related in the *Récits d'un Ménestrel de Reims*, pp. 14 to 24, though otherwise he has borrowed little from this or any other version.

A short account of the principal historical characters mentioned in the poem may here be given.

Most authorities speak of Guy de Lusignan as a man of inferior power, who by his ambitious intrigues was the cause of many of the misfortunes that befell the Holy Land. He was of no distinguished family and owed his position entirely to his marriage with Sibylla, the elder daughter of King Amalric.<sup>11</sup>

On the death of Baldwin V., Guy, instigated by his wife, laid claim to the throne of Jerusalem.<sup>12</sup> Raymond, count of Tripolis, who had been promised the regency for a certain number of years, and who was the choice both of the nobles and the people, prepared to defend his rights.<sup>13</sup> This might have caused serious dissensions among the Crusaders, had not the sudden attack of Saladin united the different factions. Guy, against the advice of Raymond and of the more cautious among the leaders, decided to assume the offensive and to march against the Saracens.<sup>14</sup>

This proved to be a fatal mistake, for by the loss of the battle of Tiberias or Hitten, the Christian army was destroyed and nearly the entire country fell into the hands of the enemy.<sup>15</sup> Guy was taken prisoner and released a year later, only on condition that he would renounce his kingdom and return to Europe.<sup>16</sup> The promise was probably never meant to be kept, and one of his first acts on regaining his freedom was to have the bishop absolve him from his oath.<sup>17</sup> Guy then proceeded to Tyre, one of the few places that still remained in the power of the Crusaders, but he was refused permission to enter by Conrad

de Montferrat. Thereupon he gathered the soldiers that were still faithful to him and laid siege to Acre.<sup>18</sup>

The dispute between Guy and Conrad was renewed with greater bitterness on the arrival of the French and English, and it was with difficulty that a compromise was finally agreed to. It was determined that Guy should continue to be recognized as King during his lifetime, and that he should be succeeded on his death by Conrad.<sup>19</sup> The agreement was, however, never carried out. Conrad was soon after murdered,<sup>20</sup> and before the conclusion of peace, the crown was given to Henry of Champagne.<sup>21</sup> Guy removed to Cyprus, which had been awarded to him by Richard as a compensation for the loss of Jerusalem, and henceforth occupied himself solely with his new kingdom until his death in 1195.<sup>22</sup>

Sibylla was the elder daughter, not the sister of King Amalric. She was first married to William Longsword, by whom she had a son, afterward Baldwin V.<sup>23</sup> In 1180, she married Guy de Lusignan, and on the death of Baldwin in 1186, she succeeded in having her husband crowned King.<sup>24</sup> By her second marriage she had two children, but both she and her children died during the siege of Acre.<sup>25</sup>

Three of the five traitors mentioned above can be easily identified; namely, Raymond, the Count of Tripolis, Conrad, the Marquis of Montferrat, and Renaud de Sagette. The Sires de Baru may be either the historical Jean d'Ibelin, le vieux Sire de Barut, or Baudouin d'Ibelin, the lord of Rame. Pierre d'Ascalone can not be identified with any of the characters of the period.

Raymond, the leader, is accused of having delivered the Holy Sepulchre to the Saracens, and of forcibly abducting the wife of Guy, in order to obtain for himself the kingdom of Jerusalem. Such an incident really occurred during the Third Crusade, but the names of

<sup>11</sup> Michaud, ii. 32; Stubbs, cv, cxxiv; Archer, 64.

<sup>12</sup> " " 39; Wilken, iii. 251; Du Cange, 343.

<sup>13</sup> " " 36; " " 241.

<sup>14</sup> " " 43; " " 273.

<sup>15</sup> " " 45; " " 295; Stubbs, 14-16.

<sup>16</sup> " " 93; " " 287, 297; " 59.

<sup>17</sup> " " 93; Stubbs, 59.

<sup>18</sup> Michaud, ii. 94; Wilken, iv, 251, 252; Stubbs, 60-62.

<sup>19</sup> " " 116, 117; " " 373; " 235, 236.

<sup>20</sup> " " 145; Stubbs, 338-341.

<sup>21</sup> " " 146, 160; " 342, 347.

<sup>22</sup> " " 383; " 350.

<sup>23</sup> " " 29, 36; Wilken, iii. 171; Stubbs, ciii. 96.

<sup>24</sup> " " 32, 39, 40; " " 196, 253; " " 97.

<sup>25</sup> " " 110; " iv, 306; " civ.

the actors are not the same as those given by our author. It was not Raymond, but Conrad of Montferrat, who on the death of Sibylla, at the time of the siege of Acre, abandoned his first wife and married Isabella, the second daughter of Amalric. Her first husband, Humphrey de Thoron, was still living, but Conrad had no difficulty in securing a divorce both for himself and for Isabella, and thus, as her husband, he became a claimant to the throne and a formidable rival to Guy.<sup>26</sup>

There was, however, some foundation for the charge of treachery brought against Raymond. He had been appointed regent during the minority of Baldwin V. and desired to retain the power in his own hands after the death of the King.<sup>27</sup> This led to an open rupture between himself and Guy. Raymond, returning to his own country, prepared to maintain his claim by force and even called in the aid of Saladin.<sup>28</sup> A serious conflict was, however, averted; for at this time the truce which the Christians had made with Saladin was broken, and the country was threatened with an invasion of the infidels. The common danger made them forget their dissensions, and they promised to unite their forces against the enemy.<sup>29</sup> But the reconciliation was in vain. The French, fifty thousand strong, under the leadership of Guy met the Saracens near the city of Tiberias, and, after a heroic struggle, lasting two days, were completely defeated.<sup>30</sup> Raymond was one of the few who escaped. He cut his way through the Saracens and fled to Tripolis, where he died shortly afterwards of despair. He was accused by both the Saracens and the Christians; by the first of having violated treaties, and by the second of having betrayed his country and religion.<sup>31</sup>

Conrad de Montferrat, by his birth—he being connected both with Leopold V. of Austria and with Frederick Barbarossa—and by his sagacity and bravery, became a celebrated leader among the Crusaders. He first served

under the Emperor Frederick in Italy, and then went to Constantinople, where Isaac, the Emperor of the East, gave him his sister in marriage and the title of Cæsar, for quelling an insurrection in the city. Eager for further distinction, he set sail for Palestine, arriving at Tyre soon after the battle of Tiberias. Here everything was in confusion, and his presence alone saved the city from destruction; for the inhabitants, hopeless of defending themselves, were making overtures to Saladin for the surrender of the place. He was at once given the chief command and, with the aid of the many knights and soldiers that flocked to his standard, soon compelled Saladin to raise the siege.<sup>32</sup> Guy also repaired to Tyre on his release from captivity, but was refused admittance by the inhabitants who were unwilling to recognize him as their king.<sup>33</sup>

The divorce of Conrad from his wife, his marriage with Isabella, and his intrigues against Guy have been related. The departure of Philip Augustus left him unsupported by any powerful prince, and considering himself continually ill-treated by Richard of England, he entered into an alliance with the Saracens.<sup>34</sup> Soon after this Conrad was assassinated. Reports differ as to the originator of the crime; one authority relates that he was killed by an emissary from the Old Man of the Mountain, Chief of the Assassins, for an injury done to some merchants. Others accused Saladin of having caused his death, while a third party believed Richard himself was the author of the crime. The latter report found its chief supporters among the French.<sup>35</sup>

Renaud, the lord of Sidon or Sagette, scarcely deserves the name of traitor. It is true he desired the election of the Marquis of Montferrat to the throne, but he was not a strong partisan, and he tried to bring about a reconciliation between Conrad and Guy even before the battle of Tiberias. Escaping to Tyre after the battle, he opened

<sup>26</sup> Michaud, ii, 110; Wilken, iv, 308; Stubbs, civ, 119-122.

<sup>27</sup> " " 36; " " iii2, 241, 249; " cii, ciii.

<sup>28</sup> " " 40; " " 257.

<sup>29</sup> " " 41, 42.

<sup>30</sup> " " 45; Stubbs, 14-16

<sup>31</sup> " " 49; Wilken, iii2, 294.

<sup>32</sup> Michaud, ii, 91, 92; Wilken, iv, 217, 225-233; Stubbs, 18, 19. Archer Table, iv.

<sup>33</sup> Michaud, ii, 93; Wilken, iv, 252; Stubbs, 60.

<sup>34</sup> " " 140; " " 480; Archer, 216.

<sup>35</sup> " " 145; " " 483; " 229-233; Stubbs, 338-341.

negotiations with Saladin for the surrender of the place, but was forced to fly before carrying out his designs. It is doubtful if his overtures to the infidels were due to a desire to betray the city. In 1192, Renaud was taken prisoner by Saladin, but was soon after released and restored to a part of his former possessions.<sup>36</sup>

The identity of the Sire de Baru can not be positively determined. In 1197, the title was conferred by Henry de Champagne upon Jean d'Ibelin, also called the vieux Sire de Barut. He was well known for his military and administrative talents, but took no prominent part in the intrigues against Guy de Lusignan.<sup>37</sup>

It was otherwise with his uncle, Baudouin d'Ibelin, the lord of Rame. Baudouin, one of the most powerful nobles of his time, strenuously opposed the election of Guy, and was in favor of marching upon Jerusalem, in order to crown Humphrey de Thoron by force of arms. After the flight of Humphrey, most of the nobles gave in their allegiance to Guy, but Baudouin still refused to recognize his authority and withdrew to Antioch. It was even asserted that he made a private treaty with Saladin, to the effect that the latter should defend his territory in case he were attacked by Guy.<sup>38</sup> This disaffection greatly weakened the cause of the Christians and made a profound impression upon the Crusader. As both Jean and Baudouin belonged to the same family, it is possible that the author may have confounded the two.

Li Baus d'Escaloingne, of the Ménéstrel de Reims,<sup>39</sup> has been changed, in the *Pas Saladin*, to Pierre Liban d'Ascalone. The proper name Pierre was added no doubt for the sake of the metre, while Liban must be a misspelling for li Baus, or le Bau. Such a person is, however, not mentioned in any of the chronicles of the period. In 1175, the title of Count of Jaffa and Ascalon was conferred upon William Longsword, Marquis of Montferrat, and after his death, two years later, was borne by Guy de Lusignan himself. Both Jaffa and Ascalon

were captured by Saladin after the battle of Tiberias.<sup>40</sup>

The names of the twelve knights who guard the defile against the Saracens are historical, and all, with the exception of Renart de Boulogne, took part in one or more of the Crusades. The list furnishes some evidence connecting the legend of the *Pas Saladin* with the battle of Jaffa, for it includes the names of three of the Crusaders who accompanied Richard in his voyage from Acre to Jaffa, in 1192; namely, William de Barres, Hugo de Florine and the Count of Cleves.<sup>41</sup>

More direct evidence is found in the corresponding list in Jean d'Avesnes and the *Chronicles of Flanders*. Both of these contain the name of André de Chauvigni, who is mentioned by all the chronicles as one of the nine mounted knights who were present at the battle.<sup>42</sup>

The names of the knights are here taken up in the order in which they are chosen by William de Barres and Hugo de Florine; lines two hundred and twenty-seven to two hundred and fifty-two.

William de Barres, one of the greatest warriors of the Third Crusade, belonged to the suite of Philip Augustus. Instead of proceeding directly to Palestine, the King and his followers remained some months in Sicily where an incident occurred, which nearly prevented de Barres from taking any further part in the Crusade. In a personal encounter between the King of England and himself, arising out of a tilting match with reeds, outside of the city of Messina, Richard was so severely handled that he ordered de Barres never to appear in his presence again. It was only by the repeated entreaties of Philip and his vassals, that Richard finally relented and that de Barres was allowed to accompany the Crusaders to the Holy Land.<sup>43</sup> Here he won great distinction, being present at the siege of Acre, and taking part in many engagements against the infidels. The time of his return is not stated, but he was at the battle of Bouvines, in 1214, where he saved the life of Philip Augustus.<sup>44</sup>

<sup>36</sup> Du Cange, 432; Wilken, 224; Michaud, ii. 49.

<sup>37</sup> " " 231; 232.

<sup>38</sup> " " 364, Michaud, ii. 40; Wilken, lii2. 254; Stubbs, cv.

<sup>39</sup> *Récits*, 21.

<sup>40</sup> Du Cange, 342. <sup>41</sup> Wilken, iv. 543. <sup>42</sup> Gaston Paris, 44.

<sup>43</sup> Michaud, iv. 133; Wilken, iv. 186; Archer, 43-46.

<sup>44</sup> Archer, 44.

The only mention of Hugo de Florine is by Wilken, in his *History of the Crusades*, ii, 543. In 1192, when Richard had definitely decided to give up the conquest of Jerusalem, and was making preparations to return to England, he was strongly urged to come to the relief of Jaffa, at that time besieged by Saladin. While part of the Crusaders marched towards the city by land, he set out by sea, and the name of Hugo de Florine occurs in the list of French knights that accompanied the King.

Geoffrey de Lusignan was the elder brother of Guy, King of Jerusalem. As one of the leaders of the Crusaders, he did excellent work at the Siege of Acre, and his name is always mentioned as that of a valiant knight.<sup>45</sup> He was, no doubt, a braver and better soldier than Guy, and Vinisauf compared his feats of arms to those of Roland and Oliver. At the news of his brother's election to the throne, in place of Raymond, the choice of the people, he is said to have exclaimed: "Well, if they have made a King of him, they would have made a God of me, if they had known me."<sup>46</sup> One clause in the settlement of the dispute between Richard and Philip that gave the throne to Guy, refers to Geoffrey, to whom was given the county of Jaffa and Ascalone, in reward for the services he had rendered the cause of the Crusaders. He did not enjoy the title long, but returned to France in October,<sup>47</sup> 1192.

The fourth knight may represent either Renaud de Chatillon or Gauche de Chatillon, as both were prominent at this period in the East.

Renaud de Chatillon, the son of a powerful nobleman of Champagne, came to the Holy Land in 1147, as a common soldier, being too poor to maintain a following of his own. Having married Constance, the widow of Raymond, prince of Antioch, he became rich and powerful, and carried on many expeditions against the infidels.<sup>48</sup> In 1160, Renaud was captured by the governor of Aleppo, and remained in prison for sixteen years. On re-

gaining his freedom, he found his wife dead, but by a second marriage he restored his fortunes and became lord of Carac, and of some castles near the frontiers of Arabia and Palestine. He now renewed his incursions into the territory of the Saracens, paying no heed to the truce that had been declared between the Christians and the infidels.<sup>49</sup> Neither Baldwin IV, nor his successors were strong enough to compel Renaud to keep the peace, and as Saladin was, therefore, unable to obtain redress, war broke out afresh. Renaud was thus the immediate cause of that terrible contest, in which Jerusalem was lost to the Christians.<sup>50</sup> After the battle of Tiberias, he was taken prisoner for the second time and, by the express orders of Saladin, slain for his alleged insults to the Mohammedan religion.<sup>51</sup>

Gauche de Chatillon, known later as the Count of St. Pol, and a crowd of noble knights arrived in Palestine in 1189. They had preceded Philip Augustus, and all joined the army of Guy de Lusignan who was besieging Acre.<sup>52</sup> Gauche greatly distinguished himself throughout the war and, after the return of Philip to France, held a high command in the Christian army under Richard. He was also present at the battle of Bouvines and died in 1219.<sup>53</sup>

Neither Renart de Boulogne, nor Walram of Limburg, the fifth and sixth knights chosen, took part in the Third Crusade. Michaud states that a count of Boulogne joined the Counts of Champagne and of Chartres in the Fifth Crusade, but nothing is said of his further adventures.<sup>54</sup>

Walram, Duke of Limburg, brother of the Duke of Brabant, took the Cross in 1196.<sup>55</sup> He was placed in command of one of the armies raised by Henry VI of Germany, and arrived in Palestine in 1197, or five years after the departure of Richard.<sup>56</sup> The Germans

<sup>45</sup> Michaud, ii, 14, 99; Wilken, iv, 253, 299, 337; Stubbs, 71.

<sup>46</sup> Robson, i, 413; Stubbs, 216.

<sup>47</sup> Wilken, iv, 373; Du Cange, 344; Stubbs, 235.

<sup>48</sup> Michaud, ii, 28; Wilken, iiii, 32; Stubbs, xcix.

<sup>49</sup> Michaud, ii, 29, 33; Wilken, iiii, 67; Stubbs, 12.

<sup>50</sup> " " 41; " " 264.

<sup>51</sup> " " 48, 50; " " 287, 289; Stubbs, 51.

<sup>52</sup> Marin, i, 172; Robson, i, 458.

<sup>53</sup> " " " " " "

<sup>54</sup> Michaud, ii, 216.

<sup>55</sup> " " 185; Wilken, v, 16.

<sup>56</sup> " " 187.

found the country in a state of peace, and, being unable to persuade the resident Christians to open hostilities, they marched against the Saracens alone. The renewed war was of short duration, for on receiving the news of the death of the Emperor Henry, the Germans re-embarked and returned to Europe in March, 1198. It is stated by Röhricht that Henry III, Duke of Limburg, with his two sons Henry and Walram, is said to have fought under Richard at Arsûf, in 1192, but it is doubtful whether he took part in the Third Crusade.<sup>57</sup>

The career of Richard, King of England, is too well known to need recounting at this place.

Philip, Count of Flanders, was the grandson of Fulk of Anjou, King of Jerusalem. He first took the Cross in 1177, in expiation, it was said, of his many sins. Baldwin IV was then on the throne, and as the leprosy by which he was attacked nearly incapacitated him for ruling, he offered the regency to Philip, who refused it. Philip's stay was short; he returned to Europe soon after Easter of the following year.<sup>58</sup> Ten years later he joined the Third Crusade; but he can not have been one of the knights that fought with Philip Augustus, since he died at the siege of Acre, in June, 1191, a short time before the arrival of the King of France.<sup>59</sup>

The identity of the next knight on our list, William Longue Espee, is doubtful. A William de Longa Spata, an Englishman, is mentioned by Wilken as being one of the knights that accompanied Richard in his expedition to Jaffa, in the latter part of 1192. No further particulars are given, and no allusion is made to him by other historians.<sup>60</sup>

The same name was also borne by William, Marquis of Montferrat, the brother of Conrad, but as he died in 1177, he could not have taken part in the Third Crusade. He was justly celebrated for his bravery and experience in war, and in 1176 was married to Sibylla, the daughter of King Amalric. Their son, later crowned as Baldwin V, died very young.<sup>61</sup>

<sup>57</sup> Wilken, v, 22,42; Röhricht, ii, 337.

<sup>58</sup> " iii2, 172,174; Michaud, ii, 29.

<sup>59</sup> " iv, 12,335; Stubbs, 217.

<sup>60</sup> " " 543.

<sup>61</sup> " iii2, 171,239,249; Michaud, ii, 29; Du Cange, 342.

Simon de Montfort, the tenth knight, was one of the leaders of the Fifth Crusade, but did not join the Third. He later became notorious for his cruel war against the Albigenses.<sup>62</sup>

A name similar to that of Bernarz, Reiz de Orstrinale, or de Horstemale, is mentioned by Röhricht, Vol. ii, p. 336. It is there stated that Bernhard, Baron of Horstmar, a German, fought under the banner of Richard, and that he drew upon himself the notice of Saladin for his great bravery in the battle before Akka. Later on he joined the army of Walram of Limburg, and distinguished himself in the battle of Bairut, in 1197.<sup>63</sup>

Dietrich, Count of Cleves, the last knight chosen, was the brother of the Bishop of Lütich. The accounts of his exploits are very meagre, but he is mentioned by both Wilken and Röhricht as taking part in the Third Crusade. He first joined the army of Frederick Barbarossa, and when the death of the Emperor left the Germans without a leader, he entered the service of the King of England. He accompanied Richard in his voyage to Jaffa, but the time of his return to Europe is not stated.<sup>64</sup>

F. E. LODEMAN.

Cornell University.

## GERMAN LITERATURE.

*Social Forces in German Literature*, a Study in the History of Civilization, by KUNO FRANCKE, Assistant Professor of German Literature in Harvard University. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1896. 8vo, pp. xiv, 577.

UPPERMOST in the mind as one closes Professor Francke's book is a grateful admiration for the wide reading, minute observation, keen insight and catholic spirit that combine to instruct and fascinate in this unique study. I know of no other book that seriously attempts Professor Francke's task, and it is a task well worth attempting, though I think it will be helpful, and possibly more helpful, to the

<sup>62</sup> Wilken, v, 112.

<sup>63</sup> Röhricht, ii, 211,354

<sup>64</sup> " " 151,330; Wilken, iv, 543.